

finches and began mobbing it, and away it went uttering a soft whistling note. Five days later, on visiting the same spot, I was lucky enough to again find a Waxwing there. It was in fine condition with four wax-like tips to the secondaries of each wing. In addition to this example, Major Magrath shot one, a male (extremely fat), in his garden in Bannu, lat. 33° (apparently the furthest southern record for this species), on the 20th of March. Colonel Ward records another secured on the 8th of the same month at 7000 feet in Kashmir.

[To be continued.]

IV.—*Note on the Corvus neglectus of Schlegel.*

By T. SALVADORI, H.M.B.O.U.

COLLEUS NEGLECTUS.

? *Corvus dauricus* β var. Pall. Zoogr. Rosso-As. p. 388 (1811).

Corvus dauricus jun. Temm. et Schleg. Fauna Jap., Aves, p. 80, tab. 40 (1850) (Japan).

Corvus neglectus Schleg. Bijdr. Dierk. Amsterd. Afl. 8, Corvus, p. 16 (1859) (Japan); Swinh. Ibis, 1867, p. 227 (Amoy); Gray, Hand-list, ii. p. 14. no. 6233 (1870); Gieb. Thes. Orn. i. p. 786 (1872) (= *C. dauricus*!); Dress. B. of Eur. iv. p. 527 (1875); Blak. et Pryer, Ibis, 1878, p. 232 (Japan); iid. Tr. As. Soc. Jap. x. p. 143 (1882); Seeb. Ibis, 1884, p. 180 (intermediate form between *C. dauricus* and *C. neglectus*; hybrid?); id. B. Jap. Emp. p. 97 (1890) (Japan, Eastern Siberia to N. China); Dress. Man. Pal. B. i. p. 420 (1902); La Touche, Ibis, 1906, p. 433 (Chinkiang).

Corvus monedula Schrenck (nec Linn.), Reis. Forsch. Amurl. i. pt. 2, p. 324 (1860); Sewerz. Journ. f. Orn. 1875, p. 171; Pleske, Mém. Ac. St. Pétersb. 1888, p. 12.

Corvus (Monedula) neglectus Swinh. Ibis, 1861, p. 259 (Talien Bay, N. China), p. 337 (between Takoo and Peking, N. China).

Lycos neglectus Swinh. P. Z. S. 1863, p. 305 (China, allied to the true *L. monedula*), p. 338 (Amoorland and Japan); 1871, p. 383 (Ningpo to Peking; closely related to *L. monedula*; also hybrid); Giglioli, Viaggio Magenta, pp. 544, 601 (1875) (Foce del Pehio e Golfo di Petchili); David et Oust. Ois. de la Chine, p. 370 (1877); Taczan. Mém. Ac. Sc. St. Pétersb. xxxix. p. 524 (1903).

Corvus dauricus part. Schleg. Mus. P.-B., Coraces, p. 35. nos. 6, 7 (1867, Japan, types of *C. neglectus*).

Monedula neglecta David, Nouv. Arch. Mus. vii. Bull. p. 9. no. 278 (1871) (Peking, Setchouan, Mongolia).

Corvus dahuricus (sic) Dyb. u. Parrex, Journ. f. Orn. 1868, p. 332 (schwarz gefärbte Varietäten, Darasun in Daurien).

Lycos dauricus part. Dyb. Journ. f. Orn. 1872, p. 453 (Kultuk); Tacz. Bull. Soc. Zool. Fr. i. p. 171 (1876) (Siberie or.).

Colæus neglectus Sharpe, Cat. B. iii. p. 28 (1877) (Shanghai); Styan, Ibis, 1891, pp. 324, 358 (Lower Yangtse, also hybrids); Pleske, Bull. Ac. Sc. St. Pétersb. 1892, p. 279; Hartert, Vög. pal. Fauna, p. 18 (1903) (höchstwahrscheinlich keine Art!); id. Nov. Zool. 1906, p. 388 (probably not a species, but a dark aberration).

Colæus monedula var. Lönnb. Ark. f. Zool. Stockh. 1905, p. 20.

Corvus dauricus var. *neglectus* Kothe, Journ. f. Orn. 1907, p. 388 (Tsintau, Kiautschou).

Colæus monedula neglectus Schalow, Journ. f. Orn. 1908, p. 117 (Central As.).

Very similar to *Colæus monedula*, from which *C. neglectus* differs in the following points:—

1st. The hind-neck is almost black, so that the black of the pileum is not sharply defined behind.

2nd. The cheeks and ear-coverts are almost black, very slightly tinged with grey.

3rd. The grey patch on the sides of the neck is much reduced, being confined to the upper part, just below the ear-coverts.

4th. Altogether *C. neglectus* is a darker bird than *C. monedula*.

5th. The dimensions are not smaller, as generally stated: one bird in the Museum of Turin has the wing 240 mm. long, while in *C. monedula* the wing is about 230 mm.

Hab. Japan and Eastern Asia from Siberia to N. China.

In the recent work of Dr. Hartert ('Die Vögel der paläarktischen Fauna') *Colæus neglectus* is treated as "höchstwahrscheinlich keine Art." I was rather surprised at this statement, especially as the Museum of Turin possesses two fine specimens obtained on board the ship 'Magenta' while staying in the Gulf of Petchili (Giglioli, 'Viaggio della Magenta,' p. 601). Therefore I was induced to investigate the status of the bird, and I soon perceived that ornithologists were at variance on the subject.

It appears that Pallas was the first to mention the bird, thinking that it was a variety of *C. dauricus*.

Temminck and Schlegel in the 'Fauna Japonica' described specimens from Japan as the young of the same bird; they also gave a good figure of it.

Later on Schlegel (Bijdr. etc.) recognised that the bird figured as the young of *C. dauricus* in the 'Fauna Japonica' was really an adult, and described it under the name of *C. neglectus*. He pointed out that the two typical specimens had the remiges and rectrices worn, so that they could not be young, and besides he rightly noticed that in the Crows the young birds do not differ much in colouring from the adults. Notwithstanding all this, in the 'Museum des Pays-Bas,' Coraces, p. 35, Schlegel went back to the earlier mistake and declared that the two types of *C. neglectus* were nothing but young birds of *C. dauricus*! Swinhoe (P. Z. S. 1871, p. 383) protested against such statement, saying: "I cannot understand Prof. Schlegel considering the following species (*C. neglectus*) the young of this bird (*C. dauricus*). I have taken this bird from the nest and found the young beginning life with all the characters of the adult."

When we consider that Swinhoe, David, Styan, and others have noticed that between the two extreme forms, the pied

C. dauricus and the dark *C. neglectus*, many intermediate forms occur, we must be led to believe that these intermediate forms are hybrids and that *C. dauricus* and *C. neglectus* are distinct species. All recent (Styan and La Touche) and earlier observers (Swinhoe and David) had not the least doubt as to the specific value of the two forms, and I quite agree with them. Of the same opinion seems to be my friend Mr. Dresser, who I think was not much at fault (Man. Pal. B. p. 420) in considering *C. neglectus* a distinct subspecies of *C. monedula*, to which Swinhoe, Giglioli, and others positively say that *C. neglectus* is nearly allied. All field-naturalists who have observed the two forms state that they are frequently found together, and we may suppose it possible that the birds not infrequently have the habit of losing sight of their proper mates.

V.—*On the Decrease in Weight of Birds' Eggs during Incubation.* By ELIZABETH SEYMOUR NORTON, F.Z.S.*

(Text-fig. 6.)

CIRCUMSTANCES arose last summer which made me curious to ascertain whether a partially-incubated Thrush's egg could be distinguished from a new-laid egg by its weight. The natural inference, in the absence of definite knowledge, seemed to be that an egg containing a living, breathing chick would be heavier than an egg containing only the nearly fluid "yolk and white." A few books that I consulted told me nothing with regard to the weight of eggs; so I began a series of incubations of hens' eggs to find out for myself what occurred. I soon discovered that all the eggs decreased in weight as incubation advanced.

After reaching this conclusion I came across the "Note" by Mr. Hugh S. Gladstone which was published in 'The Ibis' of 1904 (p. 376). Mr. Gladstone shewed the average decrease of Pheasants' eggs during incubation to be a little over 14

* Communicated by Mr. W. P. PYCRAFT, F.Z.S., M.B.O.U.